arXiv:1605.09571v1 [hep-ph] 31 May 2016

TTK-16-18

LiSK - A C++ Library for Evaluating Classical Polylogarithms and Li_{22}

Sebastian Kirchner

Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik und Kosmologie
RWTH Aachen University
Aachen, Germany

Abstract

I present a lightweight C++ library for the evaluation of classical polylogarithms Li_n and the special function Li_{22} for arbitrary complex arguments. The evaluation is possible in arbitrary precision arithmetic and features also an explicit `double` precision implementation for a much faster numerical evaluation. The implementation is based on Ref [1].

Keywords: Classical polylogarithms, Li_{22}, C++

1. Introduction

Classical polylogarithms and their multi-variable generalisations to generalised polylogarithms (GPLs) play an important role in modern quantum field theory. These functions and specialisations thereof have been studied in early works by Poincaré and Kummer, much later implicitly by Chen in his works on iterated integrals [2] and by Goncharov [3, 4, 5]. The importance lies in the fact that a large class of dimensionally regulated loop Feynman integrals in $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions have been found to be expressible in terms of these GPLs (Please refer to Refs [6, 7, 8] and references therein for more detailed discussions). It is known that all one-loop integrals up to ϵ^0 can be written in terms of the logarithm and the dilogarithm Li_2 [9]. The situation at higher orders in the ϵ expansion or, similar, at higher orders in perturbation theory, is already more involved. However, it was in Ref [1] recently proven that all GPLs up to weight four can be expressed in terms of classical polylogarithms and the special function Li_{22}. Hence the evaluation of Feynman integrals, fulfilling the

Email address: kirchner@physik.rwth-aachen.de (Sebastian Kirchner)
URL: https://bitbucket.org/SebastianKirchner/lisk (Sebastian Kirchner)

upper restrictions, and GPLs, in general, reduce then to two fundamental steps. The first is expressing all GPLs up to weight four by Li_n with $n \leq 4$ and Li_{22}. Although this step is far from trivial because divergent intermediate expressions may occur which have to be suitably regulated, a handful of methods have been proposed which, in principle, allow for a complete automatisation of this step. See e.g. Refs [1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The second step is the fast and numerically stable evaluation of the resulting Li_n and Li_{22}. I want to address the latter in this work.

Efficient algorithms for the numerical evaluation of classical polylogarithms and specific subclasses of GPLs have been developed and studied in the literature [1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. The evaluation of GPLs, and Li_{22} for that matter, with arbitrary complex arguments, however, is only publicly available in `GiNaC` [19, 20]. That specific implementation allows to evaluate GPLs without restrictions on the weight in arbitrary precision via the `CLN` library. Using the arbitrary precision implementation without exceptions obviously yields sincere performance penalties if the user is solely interested in standard floating point formats as e.g. `double` precision. The authors of Ref. [1] provide a new algorithm and also some `C++` routines for the evaluation of the classical polylogarithms and the special function Li_{22}. However, their implementation is limited to weights $n \leq 6$ of the Li_n and is exclusively given in `double` precision. Experience shows that higher precision results are often required in the computation of multi-loop Feynman integrals, such as in Ref [21, 22].

I believe that a combination of both worlds is desirable. The `template` features of the modern `C++` language allows to easily incorporate multiple supported types without duplicating the entire code. The current version of `LiSK` supports a very fast `double` precision implementation as well as an arbitrary precision implementation utilising the `CLN` library. `LiSK` implements the computation of Li_n and Li_{22} for arbitrary complex arguments using the algorithms from Ref [1]; but extends the computation of Li_n to arbitrary weights.

`LiSK` has been tested under `SUSE Linux` and is known to work with the compiler versions `g++-4.8.3`, `clang++-3.5` and `icc 14.0.2` using the GNU C++ standard library. `LiSK` can be downloaded from

`https://bitbucket.org/SebastianKirchner/lisk`

This work is structured as follows. I will explain the user interface and show an example how to use `LiSK` in Sec. 2. In Sec. 3 I will validate the results obtained by `LiSK` and conclude in Sec. 4.

2. Usage

`LiSK` is a complete *header-only* library, i.e. the library does not have to be built separately but only the header file must be included in the user's code via the usual

```
#include "lisk.hpp"
```

Please note: The implementation has been put into the *lisk.cpp* file due to readability. This source file must be present in the same directory as the header file.

`LiSK` is completely encapsulated in the namespace `LiSK` and relies on several `C++-11` features. A central part is the **CLN**[1] library by Bruno Haible and has to be linked to all programs using `LiSK`; also if using only `double` precision. A simple example of how to use `LiSK` is given in `example/example.cpp`, which can be compiled via

```
g++ -O2 -std=c++11 example.cpp -o example -I/cln/include/path
-I../LiSK -L/cln/library/path  -lcln
```

Alternatively, if `cmake` is available, simply by running

```
cmake .
```

in the `example` directory. If `CLN` is not found automatically the *CLN_INCLUDE_DIR* and *CLN_LIB* path can easily be set via

```
ccmake .
```

I will illustrate the usage of `LiSK` on this simple example. In the following `T` denotes one of the two currently supported types `std::complex<double>` and `cln::cl_N`. The first action should be to create a `LiSK` object of type `T` and precision `p` via

```
LiSK::LiSK<T> lisk(n,p);
```

During object creation `LiSK` is initialised and all constants required for the computation of the $\mathrm{Li}_n(x)$ and $\mathrm{Li}_{22}(x,y)$ are pre-computed. This reflects the main idea of `LiSK`; prepare and save all needed constants during its initialisation phase and use them during the actual computation. The constructor `LiSK`(`n` $= 4$, `prec` $= 34$) features two optional arguments.

The first argument n defines the weight of the $\mathrm{Li}_n(x)$ up to which the constants are computed during `LiSK`s initialisation phase. It is not mandatory but advised to set n to a value which resembles the highest expected weights. If higher weights are encountered during the computation the constants will be adapted dynamically. This, obviously, leads to longer evaluation times for the polylogarithms for which the higher weights have been encountered. This situation should be avoided as much as possible.

The second argument of the constructor sets the desired precision if `T` $=$ `cln::cl_N` is chosen. This argument is superfluous in the double precision case. E.g. set $p = 34$ to obtain results with 34 digit precision. Internally all floating point values are set to this precision. This is also true for the initial complex arguments x and y supplied by the user. The user has to ensure that the supplied input values match the requested precision.

[1] `CLN` can be downloaded from `http://www.ginac.de/CLN/`

Calling the public wrapper functions for the computation of $\mathrm{Li}_m(x)$ for positive integer weights m and $\mathrm{Li}_{22}(x,y)$ at given points x and y is given by

```
lisk.Li(m,x);
lisk.Li22(x,y);
```

where m should be smaller than n. One might also call

```
LiSK::LiSK<T>(n,p).Li(m,x);
LiSK::LiSK<T>(n,p).Li22(x,y);
```

but this is strongly not recommended due to the above mentioned reasons. However, special wrapper functions exist for the classical polylogarithms with weights $n \leq 4$

```
lisk.Li1(x);
lisk.Li2(x);
lisk.Li3(x);
lisk.Li4(x);
```

In case some error is encountered `LiSK` will throw a `std::runtime_error`. Hence, it is advised to put all calls to `LiSK` into a `try`-block like

```
try{
        /* some code */
}
catch(std::runtime_error &e){
        std::cout << e.what() << std::endl;
}
```

Last but not least it must be ensured that all expressions, initial and intermediate, are well defined. To this end a small positive imaginary part is added to the initial arguments x and y of $\mathrm{Li}_n(x)$ and $\mathrm{Li}_{22}(x,y)$, i.e. $x \to x - i\epsilon$. The sign of the imaginary part is chosen according to the widely used convention for mathematical software[2], which agrees for example with the convention used in `Mathematica` and `GiNaC`. The value of ϵ is set to $10^{-(p-_offset)}$ during initialisation. Hereby defines p the requested precision in the constructor ($p = 17$ in `double` precision mode). The default value of *_offset* is 2. The user can change this value at the top of the `LiSK` header[3].

3. Checks

In this section I discuss some checks of the `LiSK` library by its comparison against `GiNaC`.

[2] "[···] implementations shall map a cut so the function is continuous as the cut is approached coming around the finite endpoint of the cut in a counter clockwise direction" [23]

[3] A handful of options to change the behaviour of `LiSK` can be set in the header. However, these are of rather technical (and experimental) nature and will not be discussed here. The user is advised to proceed with caution.

Various tests in different parameter regions have been performed. Similar to Ref [1] I have checked the level of precision by evaluating Li_n (for multiple values of n) and Li_{22} at 10^4 random parameter points, where the absolute value of each point is exponentially distributed between 10^{-10} and 10^{10}. Multiple tests for real input parameters and parameters in vicinity of zero and one have been performed. In case of the `double` precision implementation all points had a relative deviation $(2|a-b|/|a+b|)$ smaller than 10^{-13}. The arbitrary precision implementation is in perfect agreement with `GiNaC`, provided that a consistent $i\epsilon$ prescription is given in both programs.

From the performance point of view `LiSK` evaluates the Li_n and Li_{22} in comparable time and orders of magnitudes faster than the current `GiNaC` implementation; depending on the parameter values. The exact timing depends on the used architecture, compiler, program setup, etc. For brevity of this work I encourage the interested user to try and compare both implementations for his specific problem. The `double` precision implementation is, as expected, much faster than using the arbitrary precision arithmetic in `CLN` and might lead to a sizeable speed-up in computations where `double` precision is sufficient.

4. Conclusions

In this work I have presented the first version of `LiSK`, an independent implementation for the numerical evaluation of Li_n and Li_{22} at arbitrary complex arguments. `LiSK` evaluates Li_n and Li_{22} in arbitrary precision but also features an explicit `double` precision implementation. The latter provides a much faster evaluation of the polylogarithms, which might be desirable for certain users. The complete `template C++` implementation provides a basis to easily extend the supported types, e.g. to the GNU Quad-Precision Math Library.

`LiSK` utilises many of the algorithms from Ref [1]. However not all of these algorithms are currently in use. Especially the numerical evaluation of Li_{22} with arguments in vicinity of one leaves room for performance improvements in upcoming versions.

5. Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through Graduiertenkolleg GRK 1675.

References

[1] H. Frellesvig, D. Tommasini, C. Wever, On the reduction of generalized polylogarithms to Li_n and $\mathrm{Li}_{2,2}$ and on the evaluation thereof, JHEP 03 (2016) 189. `arXiv:1601.02649`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2016)189`.

[2] K.-T. Chen, Iterated path integrals, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. 83 (1977) 831–879. `doi:10.1090/S0002-9904-1977-14320-6`.

[3] A. B. Goncharov, Multiple polylogarithms, cyclotomy and modular complexes, Math. Res. Lett. 5 (1998) 497–516. arXiv:1105.2076, doi:10.4310/MRL.1998.v5.n4.a7.

[4] A. B. Goncharov, Multiple polylogarithms and mixed Tate motivesarXiv:math/0103059.

[5] A. B. Goncharov, M. Spradlin, C. Vergu, A. Volovich, Classical Polylogarithms for Amplitudes and Wilson Loops, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (2010) 151605. arXiv:1006.5703, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.151605.

[6] C. Duhr, Mathematical aspects of scattering amplitudes, in: Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics: Journeys Through the Precision Frontier: Amplitudes for Colliders (TASI 2014) Boulder, Colorado, June 2-27, 2014, 2014. arXiv:1411.7538.

[7] J. M. Henn, Multiloop integrals made simple: applications to QCD processes, in: Proceedings, 49th Rencontres de Moriond on QCD and High Energy Interactions, 2014, pp. 289–292. arXiv:1405.3683.

[8] J. M. Henn, Lectures on differential equations for Feynman integrals, J. Phys. A48 (2015) 153001. arXiv:1412.2296, doi:10.1088/1751-8113/48/15/153001.

[9] R. K. Ellis, G. Zanderighi, Scalar one-loop integrals for QCD, JHEP 02 (2008) 002. arXiv:0712.1851, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/02/002.

[10] A. B. Goncharov, A simple construction of Grassmannian polylogarithmsarXiv:0908.2238.

[11] C. Duhr, Hopf algebras, coproducts and symbols: an application to Higgs boson amplitudes, JHEP 08 (2012) 043. arXiv:1203.0454, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2012)043.

[12] C. Bogner, Generalizations of polylogarithms for Feynman integrals, in: 17th International workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in physics research (ACAT 2016) Valparaiso, Chile, January 18-22, 2016, 2016. arXiv:1603.00420.

[13] C. Bogner, F. Brown, Symbolic integration and multiple polylogarithms[PoSLL2012,053(2012)]. arXiv:1209.6524.

[14] K. S. Kolbig, J. A. Mignoco, E. Remiddi, ON NIELSEN'S GENERALIZED POLYLOGARITHMS AND THEIR NUMERICAL CALCULATION.

[15] G. 't Hooft, M. J. G. Veltman, Scalar One Loop Integrals, Nucl. Phys. B153 (1979) 365–401. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(79)90605-9.

[16] J. M. Borwein, D. M. Bradley, D. J. Broadhurst, P. Lisonek, Special values of multiple polylogarithms, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 353 (2001) 907–941. arXiv:math/9910045, doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-00-02616-7.

[17] T. Gehrmann, E. Remiddi, Numerical evaluation of harmonic polylogarithms, Comput. Phys. Commun. 141 (2001) 296–312. arXiv:hep-ph/0107173, doi:10.1016/S0010-4655(01)00411-8.

[18] T. Gehrmann, E. Remiddi, Numerical evaluation of two-dimensional harmonic polylogarithms, Comput. Phys. Commun. 144 (2002) 200–223. arXiv:hep-ph/0111255, doi:10.1016/S0010-4655(02)00139-X.

[19] C. W. Bauer, A. Frink, R. Kreckel, Introduction to the GiNaC framework for symbolic computation within the C++ programming language, J. Symb. Comput. 33 (2000) 1. arXiv:cs/0004015.

[20] J. Vollinga, S. Weinzierl, Numerical evaluation of multiple polylogarithms, Comput. Phys. Commun. 167 (2005) 177. arXiv:hep-ph/0410259, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2004.12.009.

[21] T. Gehrmann, A. von Manteuffel, L. Tancredi, The two-loop helicity amplitudes for $q\overline{q}' \to V_1 V_2 \to 4$ leptons, JHEP 09 (2015) 128. arXiv:1503.04812, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)128.

[22] A. von Manteuffel, L. Tancredi, The two-loop helicity amplitudes for $gg \to V_1 V_2 \to 4$ leptons, JHEP 06 (2015) 197. arXiv:1503.08835, doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)197.

[23] B. S. Institution, The C standard, John Wiley, 2003.
URL https://books.google.de/books?id=e4whAQAAIAAJ